



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/952,995 03/26/98 LEIJON

M 70560-2/8242

MM12/0719

JOHN P DELUCA
WATSON COLE GRINDLE WATSON
1400 K STREET NW
SUITE 1000
WASHINGTON DC 20005-2477

EXAMINER

LABALLE, C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2834

DATE MAILED:

07/19/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/952,995

Applicant(s)

Leijon et al.

Examiner

Clayton E. LaBalle

Group Art Unit

2834



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Nov 28, 1997

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-23, 25-27, and 29-41 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-23, 25-27, and 29-41 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☒ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 7

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2834

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the specification refers to the preamble of claim 23 at line 39 of page 7. The specification should be complete without referring to the claims to illustrate the disclosed subject matter.

Appropriate correction is required.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The insulation being "void free" is not set forth in the original disclosure.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 11, 34-37 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2834

In claim 11, the limitation of "only a few" is unclear. In claim 34, the phrase "the cover" lacks proper antecedent basis. In claim 37, the phrase "sensible end winding loss" is without definition and unclear. Claim 40 appears to be missing text.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2, 4-9, 14, 19, 22, 25-27, 29-32, 34, and 37-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Elton ('565).

Elton discloses a cable with stranded conductors surrounded by a first semiconducting insulation layer (104), an intermediate solid insulation layer (106) and an outer semiconducting insulation layer (110) which is connected to ground. Elton discloses that this conductor can be utilized in a dynamoelectric machine.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 2834

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 10 and 35-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elton ('565) in view of Elton ('116).

Elton ('565) discloses the plant essentially as claimed except for the insulations having the same thermal coefficient of expansion.

Elton ('116) teaches that it is well known to form different overlapping insulations with the same coefficient of thermal expansion in order to prevent thermal stress to separate and crack the materials to cause failure of the insulation (see lines 38-44, col.7).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have formed the insulation of Elton ('565) such that the different layers of insulation had similar or the same coefficient of thermal expansion, as disclosed by Elton ('116), in order to prevent failure caused by thermal aging and cycling.

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elton ('565) in view of Laurell.

Elton ('565) discloses the plant essentially as claimed except for providing the cable with some strands insulated from one another and a metal screen.

Laurell teaches forming a high voltage cable. Laurell teaches that it is well known to form the cable with the conductors clumped together (figure 1), or with some of the conductors

Art Unit: 2834

separated and insulated from other conductors (see figure 2). Laurell also teaches providing a metal screen (5) which surrounds the conductor to provide support and EMF shielding.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have arranged the conductors of Elton ('565) such that some of the conductors were insulated from one another in order to provide a multiple core cable, and to have provided a metal screen surrounding the cable to shield it, as disclosed by Laurell.

Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elton ('565) in view of Bernhardt.

Elton ('565) discloses the plant essentially as claimed except for the specific dimensions of the cable and providing a static machine connected in series to limit the start current.

With respect to forming the cable with the specific claimed dimensions, it would have been an obvious matter of engineering design choice to have formed the cable with those specific dimensions, since applicant has not disclosed that those specific values solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with a cable having slightly larger or smaller values. One of ordinary skill in the art would design the cable to carry the appropriate amount of current for the desired application.

Bernhardt teaches that it is well known to provide a series connected current limiting device (22) to protect the circuit from fault currents.

Art Unit: 2834

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided a static machine in series with the connection to the motor of Elton ('565) in order to protect the motor, as disclosed by Bernhardt.

Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elton ('565) in view of Hyde and Herr.

Elton ('565) discloses the plant essentially as claimed except for connecting the neutral point of the motor to ground through and impedance or directly.

Both Hyde and Herr teach that it is well known to connect the neutral point of a motor to ground. Hyde teaches connecting a sensor device between the neutral and ground, while Herr teaches connecting directly to ground. This helps to protect the motor and reduce harmonics caused by the floating neutral connection.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have connected the neutral point of the machine of Elton ('565) to ground, as shown by Hyde and Herr, in order to protect the machine and reduce harmonics.

Claims 20-21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elton ('565) in view of Neumeyer.

Elton ('565) discloses the plant essentially as claimed except for the motor being connectable to the distribution line.

Art Unit: 2834

Neumeyer teaches providing an insulation for a High voltage machine such that it can withstand voltages greater than 36kV. Machines with such an insulation could be directly connected to the distribution lines with the need to step down the voltage.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have formed the machine of Elton ('565) such that it can withstand voltages in excess of 36kV, as disclosed by Neumeyer, in order to allow higher capacity operation of the machine.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Clayton E. LaBalle whose telephone number is (703) 308-0519. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:30 AM-4:00 PM EST and every other Friday from 6:30 AM-3:00 PM EST. The above number is equipped with voice mail. The examiner can also be reached via E-mail at Clayton.Laballe@uspto.gov to schedule an interview. E-mail should not be utilized to discuss the merits of the application.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor Ramirez, can be reached on (703) 308-1371. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 305-3432.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0956.



Clayton E. LaBalle
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2834
July 18, 1999